



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/897,412	07/03/2001	Richard J. Davis	620-148	8317

23117 7590 06/11/2003

NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
1100 N GLEBE ROAD
8TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-4714

EXAMINER

NICHOLS, CHRISTOPHER J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1647

DATE MAILED: 06/11/2003

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/897,412

Applicant(s)

DAVIS ET AL.

Examiner

Christopher Nichols, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1647

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2,4,6 and 8-10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3, 5, and 7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 July 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 8 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I (claims 1, 3, 5, and 7) in Paper No. 11 (13 May 2003) is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that both Group I and Group II are classified in the same class and subclass and searching both does not present a search burden. This is not found persuasive because while both Group I and Group II have the same classification they differ on the disease in which they are directed to for treatment. Group I requires search and consideration of cystic fibrosis while Group II requires search and consideration of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Each search being distinct and non-overlapping thus presenting a search burden on the Examiner. The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement filed 23 November 2001 (Paper No. 8) fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because citation EP 0 150 760 is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609 ¶ C(1).

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to because the Y-axis on Figures 2, 3, and 4 is labeled "Tct" which is not defined nor are unit(s) provided. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: "a", "b", and "c" are present in Figure 5 but no definition or explanation is provided in the Specification; Figure 6 has "a" and "b" as well as two lines, none of which are defined or explained in the Specification, Figure 7 has "a" and "b" which is not defined or explained in the Specification; Figures 5, 6, 7, and 9 have the Y-axis label "Isc" which is not defined or explained in the Specification; Figure 8 has symbols and four lines which are not defined or explained in the Brief Description of the Drawings (pp. 8-9). A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: the claim recites the abbreviation "CF" without definition. The Examiner suggests amending the claim to read "cystic fibrosis" to avoid possible confusion. Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 1647

6. Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 5 depends from a rejected claim. Incorporation of the limitations of claim 5 may obviate this objection.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 5 recites the limitation "Figure 1" which renders the claim indefinite and thus incomplete. "Figure 1" should be deleted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States;

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Windstetter *et al.* (30 October 1997) "Renal Function and Renotropic Effects of Secretin in Cystic Fibrosis."

Art Unit: 1647

Eur. J. Med. Res. 2(10): 431-436. Windstetter *et al.* (1997) teaches a method of administering secretin to cystic fibrosis patients thus meeting the limitations of claims 1 and 3 (Table 1). While the secretin used by Windstetter is not disclosed to act in the manner set forth in claim 1, it has been established by the courts that a product inherently possesses characteristics of that product (i.e. including the amino acid sequence of a protein). See, e.g., *Ex parte Gray*, 10 USPQ 2d; *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430). In addition,

“the PTO can require an applicant to prove that the prior art products do not necessarily or inherently possess the characteristics of his claimed product. Accordingly, since the issue in the present appeal is whether the prior art factor is identified or patently indistinct from that of the material on appeal, appellants have the burden of showing that inherency is not involved”. *Ex parte Gray*, 10 USPQ 2d 1922 (1989); *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1976).

Moreover, when the product in a product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior art product was made by a different process. *In re Thorpe.*, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Marosi*, 218 USPQ 289, 292-293 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Lastly it is noted that the courts have held that when the prior art product reasonable appears to be the same as that claimed, but differs by process in which it is produced, a rejection of this nature is eminently fair and the burden is upon the appellants to prove, by comparative evidence, a patentable difference (*In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685).

10. Claims 1, 3, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent Application Publication US 2002/0099023 A1 (25 July 2002) Boucher. US 2002/0099023 claims a method of administering an active therapeutic agent to an airway surface of a subject in need thereof, comprising administering the active agent in an effective therapeutic amount in a vehicle (claim 22). While the claim does not recite cystic fibrosis, it is disclosed in the Abstract as a

Art Unit: 1647

disease that may be treated using the disclosed invention thus meeting the limitations of claim 1.

Furthermore US 2002/0099023 teaches that the active agent may be a hormone, which may be secretin thus meeting the limitations of claims 1 and 3 (claim 23; paragraph [0040]).

Finally, the agent disclosed by US 2002/0099023 may be administered by inhalation thus meeting the limitations of claim 7 (paragraphs [0012], [0030]-[0035]). While the agent taught by US 2002/0099023 is not disclosed to act in the manner set forth in claim 1, it has been established by the courts that a product inherently possesses characteristics of that product (i.e. including the amino acid sequence of a protein). See, e.g., *Ex parte Gray*, 10 USPQ 2d; *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430). In addition,

“the PTO can require an applicant to prove that the prior art products do not necessarily or inherently possess the characteristics of his claimed product. Accordingly, since the issue in the present appeal is whether the prior art factor is identified or patently indistinct from that of the material on appeal, appellants have the burden of showing that inherency is not involved”. *Ex parte Gray*, 10 USPQ 2d 1922 (1989); *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1976).

Moreover, when the product in a product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior art product was made by a different process. *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Marosi*, 218 USPQ 289, 292-293 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Lastly it is noted that the courts have held that when the prior art product reasonable appears to be the same as that claimed, but differs by process in which it is produced, a rejection of this nature is eminently fair and the burden is upon the appellants to prove, by comparative evidence, a patentable difference (*In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685).

Summary

11. No claims are allowed.

Art Unit: 1647

12. The following art was found by the Examiner during the art search and is here made of note:

- a. Kanno *et al.* (September 2001) "Regulation of cholangiocyte bicarbonate secretion." Am. J. Physiol. Gastrointest. Live. Physiol. **281**(3): G612-G625.
- b. US 6498143 B1 (24 December 2002) Beck & Horvath
- c. US 6020310 (1 February 2000) Beck & Horvath
- d. Tietz *et al.* (30 May 2003) "Agonist-induced Coordinated Trafficking of Functionally Related Transport Proteins for Water and Ions in Cholangiocytes." The Journal of Biological Chemistry **278**(22): 20413-20419.

Art Unit: 1647

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Christopher James Nichols, Ph.D.** whose telephone number is 703-305-3955. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Gary Kunz, Ph.D.** can be reached on 703-308-4623. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-872-9307 for After Final communications. The fax phone numbers for the customer service center is 703-872-9305

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

CJN
June 9, 2003


GARY KUNZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600